



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,625	02/25/2004	Duane C. Carlson	Westinghouse 020092.00071	3075
27863	7590	03/15/2005		EXAMINER
MCNAIR LAW FIRM, PA P.O. BOX 10827 GREENVILLE, SC 29603-0827			CYGAN, MICHAEL T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2855	

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AK

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/786,625	CARLSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael Cygan	2855

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 10-17 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,5-7,18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3,4,8,9 and 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/25/2004
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pourprix (US 5,150,036) in view of Gonthier (US 4,788,430). Pourprix teaches an aerosol contaminant extractor comprising a housing [36] with inlet port [34], outlet port [38], ionizer [32], removable collector substrate [46] positioned between ground plates [42] and positively charged to collect charged aerosols, high voltage source (not explicitly disclosed, but must inherently be present to effect the high

voltage charging), and means for moving the air ([22]; column 2 lines 30-42). The collector substrate is a plate, which is essentially a thick metal foil. The shape of the components appears from Figures 2 and 6 to be cylinders; essentially a generally rectangular parallelepiped shape. Although the weight is not listed, it would have been either an inherent property or involve merely an obvious change of size, since such is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPQ 1955).

Pourprix teaches the claimed invention except for an access port, tape, and analysis. Gonthier teaches the use of an access port (column 4 lines 15-18), tape as an alternative to plates (column 7 lines 34-39), and analysis of collected particles (column 4 lines 26-58). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an access port, tape, and analysis, since the port allows the advantages of easy access to the chamber interior thus simplifying assembly, use and repair; the tape and analysis allows a continuously collecting and analyzing mechanism for real-time reporting of particle collection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 10-17 are allowed.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art neither discloses nor fairly teaches the use of the extractor as claimed with any one of the following: storage means, external electrical power receptacle connected to fan and high voltage supply means, plastic/deposited metal collector substrate, and ionizer within housing.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ionization units are disclosed by Masuda (JP 59081564), Gourdine (US 3,718,029), Taylor (US 6,176,977 B1), Masuda (US 4,357,150), Williams (US 5,302,190), and Hattori (US 5,466,279).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cygan whose telephone number is (571) 272-2175. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6 M-Th, alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Lefkowitz can be reached on 571-272-2180. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2855

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



MICHAEL CYBALL, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER